

**Table of Contents**

<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
5.1 OVERVIEW.....	5-1
5.2 CLOSEOUT DOCUMENTS .....	5-2
5.2.1 Forms and Templates.....	5-2
5.3 A/E PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS .....	5-3

**List of Exhibits**

<b><u>Exhibit</u></b>		<b><u>Page</u></b>
Exhibit 5.3-A	STANDARD FORM 1421 .....	5-4
Exhibit 5.3-B	PERFORMANCE RATING .....	5-6

**Forms and Templates**

<b><u>Exhibit</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
5.2.1 CLOSEOUT CHECKLIST	<a href="#">5-2</a>
5.2.1 SF 1034 FINAL VOUCHER	<a href="#">5-2</a>
5.2.1 CONTRACTOR'S RELEASE OF CLAIMS	<a href="#">5-2</a>
5.2.1 TASK ORDER CLOSEOUT LETTER TO A/E	<a href="#">5-2</a>
5.2.1 COTR'S FINAL REPORT	<a href="#">5-2</a>

# **CHAPTER 5**

## **TASK ORDER CLOSEOUT**

### **5.1 OVERVIEW**

Following the final acceptance of work, the Division closes out the task order file. The closeout process involves the CO, COTR, Programs Manager, Finance Manager and A/E consultant.

The COTR plays an important role in determining whether the A/E consultant has satisfactorily performed the required work and has met contractual obligations. The task order is physically complete when the A/E consultant has completed the required services and the Government has inspected and accepted the deliverables. A primary objective of the closeout is to identify and resolve any outstanding obligations or pending liabilities of either the Government or the A/E consultant and to ensure proper documentation of all contract-related decisions.

Following the COTR's indication by formal documents that the contract is physically complete, individuals acting on behalf of the CO begin administration of the closeout.

As part of the closeout process, the COTR also submits an evaluation of the A/E consultant's performance. This information becomes part of the official record and serves as the basis for evaluating the contractor's past performance in future source selections. The CO may provide the consultant with a copy of the evaluation, and the consultant may submit a response to an evaluation reflecting poor performance.

## **5.2 CLOSEOUT DOCUMENTS**

The COTR initiates administrative closeout of task orders and uses the Closeout Checklist to confirm completion of all activities necessary to close out the task order. The Closeout Checklist shows completion dates for specified activities, including the A/E Performance Evaluation (see [Section 5.3](#)). The COTR completes the Closeout Checklist and routes it, with all the documents attached, through the CO, who forwards it to Finance for final payment, processing and closing of the contract account. The COTR maintains a copy of the Closeout Checklist and its attached documents in the COTR file.

### **5.2.1 Forms and Templates**

To view or download forms and templates, use the links below:

- [Closeout Checklist.](#)
- [SF 1034 Final Voucher.](#)
- [Contractor's Release of Claims.](#)
- [Task Order Closeout Letter to A/E.](#)
- [COTR's Final Report.](#)

### 5.3 A/E PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

The COTR conducts the performance evaluation of the A/E consultant. Generally, the COTR conducts these performance evaluations at the following times:

- When the COTR is changed.
- When the task order is completed (included with the closeout package).
- When interim evaluations are needed during long projects.
- When poor performance is identified.

The COTR considers all the circumstances of the project when rating the performance of an A/E consultant, including the complexity of the project, the environment (for example, hostile public, difficult partner agency or remote locations), the Government's performance (for example, reviews and comments) and other project-related factors.

Evaluating the performance of an A/E consultant is a process similar to a Federal Government supervisor evaluating the performance of a Federal employee. In other words, SF 1421 (see [Exhibit 5.3-A](#)) should include more than just checkmarks in the applicable boxes. It should tell the "story" of the project. The COTR should always include some narrative in the last box of the form or on a continuation/attachment page.

The COTR provides the performance rating documents to the CO (see [Exhibit 5.3-B](#)). The CO determines whether to provide copies of the documents to the A/E consultant, allowing the consultant to submit a response to the rating.

## Exhibit 5.3-A STANDARD FORM 1421

<b>PERFORMANCE EVALUATION (ARCHITECT-ENGINEER)</b>				1. PROJECT NUMBER	
				2. CONTRACT NUMBER	
IMPORTANT: Be sure to complete Performance section on reverse. If additional space is necessary for any item, use Remarks section on reverse.					
3. TYPE OF REPORT <i>(Check one)</i>  <input type="checkbox"/> INTERIM <input type="checkbox"/> COMPLE- TION OF DESIGN OR STUDY <input type="checkbox"/> COMPLE- TION OF CONSTRUC- TION <input type="checkbox"/> TERM- INATION			4. REPORT NUMBER		5. DATE OF REPORT
6. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR			7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION		
8. OFFICE RESPONSIBLE FOR:					
A. SELECTION OF CONTRACTOR		B. NEGOTIATION/AWARD OF CONTRACT		C. ADMINISTRATION OF CONTRACT	
9. CONTRACT DATA					
A. TYPE OF WORK			B. TYPE OF CONTRACT  <input type="checkbox"/> FIXED-PRICE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <i>(Specify)</i>  <input type="checkbox"/> COST-REIMBURSEMENT		
C. PROJECT COMPLEXITY  <input type="checkbox"/> DIFFICULT <input type="checkbox"/> ROUTINE  <input type="checkbox"/> SIMPLE		D. PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT			
		INITIAL FEE \$		AMENDMENTS NO.    AMOUNT \$	
		CLAIMS BY CONTRACTOR NO.    AMOUNT \$		TOTAL FEE \$	
E. DATE CONTRACT AWARDED		F. CONTRACT COMPLETION DATE <i>(including extensions)</i>		G. ACTUAL COMPLETION DATE OF CONTRACT	
10. KEY CONSULTANT DATA					
A. NAMES		B. ADDRESS		C. SPECIALTY	
11. CONSTRUCTION COSTS		A. INITIAL ESTIMATE \$		B. AWARD \$	
		C. ACTUAL \$			
12. CONSTRUCTION CHANGES AND DEFICIENCIES		NUMBER		TOTAL	
A. CONSTRUCTION CHANGES				\$	
B. CONSTRUCTION CHANGES RESULTING FROM DEFICIENCIES IN A-E PERFORMANCE				\$	
C. DEFICIENCIES PAID FOR BY A-E				\$	
D. DEFICIENCIES PAID FOR BY GOVERNMENT				\$	
13. OVERALL RATING  <input type="checkbox"/> EXCELLENT <input type="checkbox"/> AVERAGE <input type="checkbox"/> POOR			14. RECOMMENDED FOR FUTURE CONTRACTS?  <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <i>(If "NO," explain in REMARKS on reverse)</i>		
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF RATING OFFICIAL			16A. NAME AND TITLE OF REVIEWING OFFICIAL		
15B. SIGNATURE		15C. DATE		16B. SIGNATURE	
				16C. DATE	
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <span>NSN 7540-01-155-3244</span> <span>STANDARD FORM 1421 (10-83) Prescribed by GSA FAR (48 CFR) 5.236-2(d)</span> </div>					

### Exhibit 5.3-A STANDARD FORM 1421 (Continued)

<b>STAGES OF SERVICES</b> <i>(As applicable)</i>					<b>PERFORMANCE</b>										<b>RATED BY</b>  CODE LEGEND:    + EXCELLENT A AVERAGE P POOR N/A NOT APPLICABLE NI NO INFORMATION	
					NOT APPLICABLE	RATING FACTORS/RATING								SIGNATURE AND DATE		
						ACCURACY	COMPLETENESS	COOPERATION	COORDINATION	MANAGEMENT	MEETING SCHEDULE	PERSONNEL ABILITY	WORK QUALITY			
CONCEPTS	SCHEDULE <i>(Mo., day, yr.)</i>	FROM	TO	ARCH.												
				STRU.												
	ACTUAL <i>(Mo., day, yr.)</i>	FROM	TO	MECH.												
TENTATIVES	SCHEDULE <i>(Mo., day, yr.)</i>	FROM	TO	ARCH.												
				STRUC.												
	ACTUAL <i>(Mo., day, yr.)</i>	FROM	TO	MECH.												
WORKING DRAWINGS	SCHEDULE <i>(Mo., day, yr.)</i>	FROM	TO	ARCH.												
				STRUC.												
	ACTUAL <i>(Mo., day, yr.)</i>	FROM	TO	MECH.												
ESTIMATES				A/S												
CRITICAL PATH METHOD				M/E												
POST CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT SERVICES				PRE-AWARD POST-AWARD SHOP DWGS. MAN- UALS												
INSPECTION				FIELD												
SOLICITATION DOCUMENTS				OFFICE												
REMARKS																

**STANDARD FORM 1421 BACK** (REV. 10-83)

Save Data Only
Clear Form
Save Form & Data
Email Form
Retrieve Data



**Exhibit 5.3-B PERFORMANCE RATING**

<b>Performance Evaluation Criteria</b>						
		Submarginal (1)	Marginal (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)
Time of Delivery	Adherence to Task Order Schedule	Consistently late on 20% of submittals	Consistently late on 10% of submittals w/o prior agreement.	Occasional submittal late w/o justification	Meets task order schedule	Delivers all submittals & change requirements on schedule
	Action on Anticipated Delays	Does not expose changes or resolve as soon as recognized	Exposes changes but is slow in resolution on submittal	Anticipates changes, advises FHWA but misses completion of submittals	Keeps FHWA posted on delays, resolves independently on submittal	Anticipates in good time, advises FHWA, resolves independently and meets schedule
	Design Support Submittals (i.e. Geotech, ROW, etc..)	Does not complete interrelated submittals/studies concurrently	Support submittals/studies completed but PS&E changes delayed.	Major work items coordinated in time to meet Task Order schedule.	All design revisions recommended by support submittals included in time to meet T. O. schedule	Design revisions, submittal/studies resolved, and test data issued ahead of T.O. schedule.
Quality of Work	Work Appearance	25% of plans not compatible with FHWA processes and use	20% of plans not compatible with FHWA processes and use	10% of plans not compatible with FHWA processes and use	0% of plans not compatible with FHWA processes and use	0% of plans presented (including subs) not compatible with FHWA processes and use
	Thoroughness and Accuracy of Work	Is PS&E package tending to leave questionable situations for FHWA to resolve	Has followed guidance, type and standard drawings	Has followed guidance, type and standard dwgs. questioning and resolving doubtful areas	Work completed with notes and thorough explanation for anticipated questionable areas	Work of highest caliber incorporating all pertinent data required including related activities.
	Engineering Competence	Tendency to follow past practice with no variation to meet requirements of job in hand	Adequate engrg. to use and adapt existing designs to suit job on hand for routine work	Engineered to satisfy specs., guidance, plans and materials provided	Displays excellent knowledge of construction requirements, cost and procurement problems	Exceptional knowledge of FHWA work & use of innovative solutions
	Liaison Effectiveness	Indifferent to requirements of subconsultants and FHWA advice	Satisfactory but dependent on FHWA to force resolution of problems w/o constructive recommendations to subconsultants	Maintains normal contact with subconsultants depending on FHWA for problem resolution	Maintains independent contact with all subconsultants, keeping them informed to produce compatible submittals w/ little assistance from FHWA	Maintains expert contact, keeping FHWA informed, obtaining information from all subconsultants w/o prompting from FHWA
	Independence and Initiative	FHWA provided constant surveillance to keep job from slipping	Requires occasional prodding to stay on schedule & expects FHWA resolution of most problems	Normal interest and desire to provide workable plans with average assistance & direction by FHWA	Complete/accurate job, free of incompatibilities w/ little or no direction by FHWA	Develops complete/ accurate PS&E, seeks/resolves issues ahead of schedule w/ little or no direction by FHWA
Effectiveness in Controlling and/or Reducing Costs	Utilization of Personnel	Planning of work left to designers, management only seen at major milestones, quality control measures almost non-existent	Project Manager sets & reviews work for designers. Numerous modifications to submittals are required after FHWA review	Project Manager sets & reviews work for designers, quality control measures in place	Project Manager sets & reviews work for designers and subconsultants, quality control measures in place for all products.	Modifications to final design limited to less than 5% as a result of lack of engineering or FHWA compatibility
	Design within Funding Limitation	Does not meet funding limit for original work or changes.	Met funding limit w/in 20% for original work or changes with FHWA direction/resolution	Met funding limit w/in 10% for original work or changes with FHWA direction/resolution	Met funding limit for original work or changes. Resolved w/ little or no direction by FHWA	Met funding limitation. Resolved independently.

### Exhibit 5.3-B PERFORMANCE RATING (Continued)

A/E Consultant Performance Evaluation Report						
Consultant: Project/Number/Name:			Performance Period: Report Date:		To	
Category	Criteria	Rating (A)	Item Factor (B)	Evaluation Rating (C) = A x B	Category Factor (D)	Efficiency Rating (E) = C x D
Time of Delivery	Adherence to Task Order Schedule		0.40			
	Action on Anticipated Delays		0.30			
	Design Support Submittals (i.e. Geotech, Environ, Wetland Del, etc..)		0.30			
Total Item Weighted Rating					0.40	
Quality of Work	Work Appearance		0.15			
	Thoroughness and Accuracy of Work		0.30			
	Engineering Competence		0.30			
	Liaison Effectiveness		0.15			
	Independence and Initiative		0.10			
Total Item Weighted Rating					0.40	
Effectiveness in Controlling and/or Reducing Costs	Utilization of Personnel		0.5			
	Design within Funding Limitation		0.5			
Total Item Weighted Rating					0.20	
Total Weighted Rating						

Note: Provide supporting data and/or justification for submarginal or outstanding rating.